

FEMINISM

- Contemporary studies and theories
- The spatial organization of society;
a study of its "sexual spheres".

Malfridur Klara Kristiansen

Junior Fellow 1984-1985

The contents of this paper are the results of the writer's studies as a Junior Fellow at the Johns Hopkins Center for Metropolitan Planning and Research, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, during the academic year 1984-1985.

Table Of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. 1. Literature and feminism
 - 2. Empirical studies
 - 3. Feminist theories
- III. The spatial organization of society, a study of its "sexual spheres".
- IV. The current discussion and conclusion
- V. Bibliography

I

Introduction:

This paper is divided into two main sections.

In chapter II, I present a short overview of contemporary literature and studies aimed at revealing the various forms of oppression women suffer in society by rewriting history and reinterpreting existing knowledge.

In chapter II, I also introduce and discuss the various feminist theories. Chapter III is devoted to a study of the spatial organization of society and of how it reflects as well as reproduces the subjection of women.

My analyses of the history of design (design meaning not only form, but also the organization of functions) are based in the theory of socialist feminism.

In my conclusion, I discuss some current reforms which concerned architects, planners and sociologists have proposed and promoted and the role these reforms play in the liberation of women.

"The thesis of masculine scholarships is firmly established; the feminist antitheses are barely beginning to take form . . . those who have spent time generating feminist perspectives on human knowledge are aware of how much remains to be done. Each layer of lies and distortions peeled away reveals another needing to be questioned . . .

Perhaps at some point we will have retilled the epistemological soil sufficiently that nothing is left of the androcentric perspective. But the completion of this all encompassing pursuit is nowhere in sight and in fact cannot even be conceptualized at this point. To the extent that we can vaguely imagine our final goal, we may envision a new beginning for the human race . . . (where) . . . hierarchial divisions which now polarize us by sex, age, class, race, lifestyle and so forth may one day be devoid of power implications . . . (but) . . . patriarchy has had a several millenia head start on any more humane world view. Dismembering it will require all our energies for the foreseeable future."

(Clare Bright in "But what about men?")

II

The body of (contemporary) feminist studies can be sorted roughly into 2 main divisions:

- Theoretical studies and speculations and
- Empirical research and other "creative writings" (fiction, poetry, etc.)

The empirical studies and the other literary endeavors are focused on describing how the institution of patriarchy operates and revealing the methods and symptoms of oppression.

This has been done not so much by challenging the methods of research or writing as by simply asking new questions, by formulating thoughts and observations in a different way.

1.

Literature (creative writing):

I do not like to label any woman writer as a feminist writer by the very fact that she writes about persons of her own sex, something male writers have done through the ages without being classified as a separate political group. However, many contemporary writers, mostly women, are and have been key factors in raising consciousness of feminist issues by its readers simply by articulating thoughts, experiences and situations different from the established knowledge.

A well known writer is the American Marilyn French whose fiction made the bestseller stands nationwide and abroad. Her writings described the unrecognized frustrations of women in the post World War II American dream. Throughout the world, literature by women is being acknowledged. This literature is

often, by its very nature of articulating "unknown territories," both extremely interesting and explosive. I am tempted to claim that the most interesting and vital literature published in the U.S.A. today is written by women and especially by women of racial minorities. These are, amongst others Virginia Woolf, Anais Nin, Marilyn French, Marge Piercy, Adrienne Rich, Audre Lorde, Maxine Hong Kingston, Maya Angelou, Alice Walker, Toni Morrison, Alice Munroe, Ursula K. LeGuinn, Judy Chicago and Doris Lessing.

2. Empirical Studies:

The body of empirical research concerning women's situation in society is growing rapidly. As stated earlier, the emphasis is not on making new disciplines but rather to ask new questions inside established disciplines, and to interpret established "truths" from a different point of view. (e.g. to analyze Freud's contributions to feminine psychology in the view of social conditions: Juliet Mitchell, 1971, 1974, S. Firestone, 1971).

These studies do not necessarily have feminist theory as a foundation but are triggered instead by the increasing number of women in various disciplines, especially in behavioral sciences, who have noticed the absence of studies concerning women, or who disagree with studies already done.

Studies of behavioral attitudes include the examination of the role of body language and voice as a tool of dominance, and the technique of exchanging information and even humor as direct tools of excluding women from power participation. (Berit Aas, 1981, Ann Falkinger, 1983, Anne Chapman in "Women and Environments 1985," Nancy Henley, 1977).

Linguistic studies focus on revealing the implicit sexist structure of our "man-made" language (Dale Spender, 1985). The social function of clothing has been shown to reflect the image of women at a given time. The femme fatale, the romantic peasant, the covered Islamic woman, the modern professional superwoman . . . , and how fashion not only objectifies women, but also spatially restricts her; from Chinese footbinding to modern high heels. (Gayle Rubin in "Feminist Frameworks" 1984).

Historical studies have shown that the notions or myths of love - romantic love, motherhood, femininity, sexuality, etc. - have served both economic and patriarchal purposes. These myths have been given legitimacy with findings in both the natural and behavioral sciences, (e.g. Freudian psychology, or pedagogic - right side, left side of the brain theories). The discipline of medicine has produced an ocean of proofs on the "nature" of woman. For example, in 19th century America it was "proved" that a woman's uterus would dry up with the use of her brain. In a recent British medical journal an empirical study was published on the tendency of feminists to be hairy and masculine, implying that feminism is a matter of an accumulation of unnatural hormones! (Sarah Begus class discussions, 1985, S. Firestone, 1971, J. Mitchell, 1971, S. DeBeauvoir, 1949).

Anthropologists are doing intensive work on both studying women's role and position in various societies and on reinterpreting existing knowledge. This is important since among others it is understood that anthropologists project their own notion of society upon the study subject, generally very sexist notions. Most rituals concerning womanhood and spatial seclusion have been automatically considered dirty and anti-spiritual, while male rituals have been considered

functions of spirituality and purity. One recent study has revealed that anthropological data on a specific Australian society used 80% of the published results to describe hunting, the male occupation, while the female work in agriculture, which stood for 70% of the nourishment, got the remaining 20% (Rayna R. Reiter, 1975, Margaret Mead).

Historical studies reveal the powerful tool of religion and philosophy in justifying the domination of men over women, in this world and even others. Christian theology advocates the biological inferiority and evilness of women, while the Islamic scripts order men to restrain their women in order to conceal their immense powers.

Zofokles and other known thinkers have claimed "silence to be woman's modest crown," and throughout history her capacity for intelligence has been debated. (The question of man's role in this world has caused considerable confusion and philosophical speculation dating from the days of Plato and Aristotle. These questions are now raised again by females thousands of years later, after their alienation and frustration originated and intensified under oppressive male culture. (Al Hibri in "Women and Revolution," 1981, S. DeBeauvoir, 1949).)

In the U.S.A. there is a popular belief that role models and mentors are a prerequisite for one's success and career to bloom. Here there have been various studies on the obstacles women meet as prospective proteges, and the lack of women as role models in the majority of occupations (50% of "working" women participate in approx. 10% of listed occupations) is now being recognized as a significant obstacle for women wishing to branch out in different directions (L. W. Fitt and D. A. Newton, 1982, Ann Falkinger, 1983, Denise Palit in "The Subtle Revolution," 1979).

Studies of the power relationships between men and women inside radical political and labor movements reveal inherent patriarchal structures, so that even though equality between the sexes is on the agenda, the women's position inside the organization tends to be service oriented (coffee makers, envelope lickens). This means that their special demands are constantly put on the waiting list to make room for more "pressing issues." In those countries where socialistic revolutions have taken place, with equal contributions of women and men, women are not seen in any decision making positions, and have also largely disappeared from the history books. (Example is Cuba, Algiers, USSR,) -writing their story is becoming a major task (J. Mitchell, 1966, 1971, Clara Zetkin in "Women, the Family and Freedom," 1983, Al Hibri in "Women and Revolution, 1981, S. Firestone, 1971).

Criminology has not been untouched by this urge to understand the role women have played in society and a variety of crimes committed by women are now used as tools in explaining social history. (Mary S. Hartmann, 1977, in "Victorian Murderesses", writes on the social history of 19th. century women from an illuminating perspective: Their favorite murderesses.) Contemporary crimes committed by women are being mapped and studied in light of indiscriminatory psychological knowledge as well as social conditions. (Psychological profiles used by the police are in question as being simplistic and discriminatory; for instance the general method of describing the mothers of rapists and murderers in detail in order to get a pattern or motive for the crime.) Studies which have proven especially important for me, as my main motive for undertaking a study of "feminist" scholarship was to understand the dialectical relationship between woman's role and position in society and the spatial

organization of built structures, have been those directly aimed at space, distances and economy. These include studies of women's presence in the labor force (Joan Mandel, 1979, Ann Falkinger, 1983); the role and changing role of the family structure in society (Kathleen Gerson in APA Journal, 1983, S. Firestone, 1971, J. Mitchell, Joan Mandle, 1979, S. DeBeauvoir, 1979, Bettina Aptheker, 1983); studies of household economy (Ann Oaklay, 1976, Ann Markussen in "Woman and the American City," 1981); studies of social/class categorization (M. E. Mazey and David R. Lee, 1983); definitions and redefinitions of the "neighborhood" (Gerda Werkele, at the "APA Conference, 1985," D. Hayden, 1984, J. Leavitt, at the "APA Conference, 1985," Ann B. Shlay and D. A. DiGregorio, 1985); geographical mappings of the spatial mobility and transportation needs of women (Mazey, Lee, 1983, Marion B. Fox, APA Journal, 1983, Lopata in "Woman and the American City," 1983); mappings of the cultural spatial restrictions of women, religion, crimes (Susan Saegert, Galem Granz in "Woman and the American City," 1983, D. Hayden, 1981); the effects of zoning restrictions especially for women (Netter and Ruth G. Price in APA Journal, 1983); women's access to credit (Emily Care in "Women and the American City, 1983"); studies of the historical meaning of technology for women in industry, household, and transportation and the need for feminist critique of modern technology (D. Hayden, Ursula Franklin in "Woman and Environment," 1985, 1981, 1984, Ann Oakley).

The list of scholars and their works is extensive and these examples that I have given are only intended to give an idea of the nature and themes of this intradisciplinary and interdisciplinary research which is aimed primarily at illuminating women's role and position in history and society. The themes touched upon reflect thoughts as well and studies that I have been involved in during the last months.

3.

Feminist Theories:

In theoretical studies "feminism" (i.e. the study of women's role and place in society) is seen either as an extension of existing socioeconomic theories, such as liberalism or marxism, or is treated as a separate theory in opposition to existing dogma. (I would like to thank Sarah Begus, who through her excellent lectures in the JHU 1985 spring class, "Feminism, Thinkers, Texts and Movements," clarified many of these theories for me. Although the sources for this chapter are many, I have relied especially upon these books: Feminist Frameworks ed. by Jagger and Rothenberg, The Feminist Papers ed. by A. Rossi, Women and Revolution ed. by L. Sargent and Women, the Family and Freedom, ed by Bill Offen).

The theoretical literature dealing with the oppression of women as a part of the societal structure as a subject to change, ranges from liberal thought, where the obstacles to equality between the sexes are seen as a matter of custom and legislation, to lesbian feminism, which claims that equality can be attained only through complete economic and cultural restructuring of society, where economic and legislative equality do not discriminate against anyone on account of race, sex, class, age or sexual preferences.

Existing feminist frameworks can be divided "roughly" (overlapping is frequent) into several categories where the systems of domination are analyzed differently.

Single system theories:

Liberal feminism

Liberal feminism has its origins in the social contract theories of the 16th and 17th century which argue for "the equal opportunities of all human beings to acquire education and training commensurate with their ability and the opportunity to use that training to achieve whatever place in society that the individual is able."

The liberal feminist arguments are, in a way, modern applications of Adam Smith's classic belief that when each individual pursues her or his own economic self interest, the invisible hand of Providence, working through marked economy, will coordinate these selfish strivings so that the net consequences are to benefit all (Alison M. Jagger, Paula Rothenberg, *Feminist Frameworks*, 1984).

In liberal feminism there is a notion that the public sphere (legal, governmental sphere) is where our lives are totally defined. The early feminists were quite radical for this period of time (Mary Wolstonecraft, 1791, J. S. Mill and Harriet Taylor 1869, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony 1865-1902) and all demanded equal access to education for both sexes and voting rights for women. Legislative rights are still on the liberal feminists' agenda (NOW; National Organization for Women, and ERA; the fight for the Equal Rights Amendment). Now the goals are aimed at prohibiting easily visible inequalities such as type of employment, size of paycheck decided by the sex of the worker and the fight against rape, pornography and sexual harassment.

Liberal feminists do not concern themselves with "the politics of the family" or the belief that the state should or does interfere in that matter because as soon as equality is attained then everyone will be able to choose their own lifestyle. As the liberal feminists oversee the power of the economic system, and do not see the class system as a problem in itself, the question which remains to be asked is, to whom do women want to be equal? Using the example of Scandinavia, where women have full and equal legislative status, the sex division of society has not been challenged in any great way, women's economic equality has only slightly improved and they are still sexually oppressed.

Traditional Marxism:

Traditional Marxism analyzes the inequality between the sexes as being of economic origins.

Marxists explain the first division of labor between the sexes as due to the increase in wealth and the institution of private property. This supposedly happened in ancient times as men used their physical power to gain mastery over newly developed agricultural households, including the domestication of animals. They argue that monogamy was the victory of private property over primitive natural communal property (F. Engels 1981). Modern capitalistic systems are seen as extensions of these organizations and as the capitalists' major motive is to get as much surplus value as possible, the division of labor between the sexes is a practical tool in keeping the labor movement split. It has created a system enforced by custom and even legislation, that enforces tension between the sexes as well as having them believe in their separate interests. The male labor movements have frequently seen the reserve army of low paid women as being in competition with their own interests.

Marxists argue that women should become full members of the labor force so that they can struggle with men to overthrow the system of private property and class domination, which in the first instance is their source of oppression. In order to achieve this end, they understand that housework must become industrialized and also that cultural revolution is necessary in order to wipe out the remains of attitudes and customs.

Marxist theory explains why women became subordinated as they gained direct and potential exchange value, but does not explain the almost universal division of labor between the sexes, i.e., why sex becomes gender. In other words, they

explain women's usefulness to capitalism as the genesis of their oppression, but forget that women have also been oppressed in societies which by no stretch of the imagination can be described as capitalistic. This theory deals with economic systems as the only moving force of society and is therefore unable to explain why sexual oppression of women is apparent in almost all cultures and in all steps of the hierarchy, from the slave to the bankowner,- the exact reason why women have managed to unionize in such large number solely on the grounds of their sex.

Anarchist Feminism:

Anarchist feminism had its early and most fierce spokeswoman in Emma Goldman, activist, founder and editor of the Mother Earth Magazine, at the turn of the century.

Although anarchists see centralized governmental and economic power, including the possession of private property as the genesis of all oppression, anarchist feminists include the dualism of the sexes in their analyses, dualism which is established in ideas of gender, custom and values.

While anarchist feminists agree with Marxists and liberals that economic inequality and customary behavior is oppressive, they disagree with their methods of achieving liberation. In contrast to Marxism, anarchists see that the absence of centralized laws, regulations and state interference in economic decisions is a prerequisite for the individual to "grow" and become a responsible person, but in contrast to liberals, they see the abolition of private property and decentralization as an absolute necessity for this growth to become "healthy".

Radical Feminism:

Radical feminism is a very recent political theory, and its emphasis has been that the "personal is political." Instead of what they "perceive as undue liberal and Marxist emphasis on the so-called public world," (Fem. Frameworks 1984) radical feminists have tended to focus more sharply on male dominance in the so-called private life. They also believe that the oppression of women is fundamental, and that women are first dominated by men, then by race and class. From this understanding they draw a conceptual model for understanding all other forms of oppression. "Our sex (gender system) has roots in the organization of reproduction, which appear to have predicted all forms of class society." (Linda Gordon: Marxian Persp., fall, 1978).

A radical feminist explanation of the reasons for this situation could be that men were both envious and afraid of women's evident ability to reproduce, so they used their physical advantage of "constant" strength to establish themselves as dominant in society. Men supposedly also developed weapons for this purpose and in time, more glory was laid upon hunting, animated gods, male gods, the glory of war, while all matters concerning womanhood were made taboo and less important. Even the symbol of fertility was supposedly removed from the vulva to the phallus as the men claimed the procreative forces to be theirs, with women treated merely as vessels. This resulted in patriarchal structure based on men's inability to reproduce - their quest to be immortal. In time, this sexual oppression resulted in economic oppression.

Radical feminism is a new and developing theory and its discussions focus on what line of action can be taken to alter this biologically-rooted patriarchy. In contrast to conservatism, which uses the visible biological differences (race, age,

sex) as justification of inequality, radical feminism takes action against the inequality. Radical feminists claim that there is no reason why biological differences or psychological differences (there is disagreement amongst Radical feminists on how much modern gender characteristics are really rooted in biology) should result in the subjection of either sex, since the presence of both sexes is necessary for humans to live in balance on the earth.

As a result of the radical feminist analyses, an early theoretician, S. Firestone, 1971, came to the conclusion that if women were to be liberated, then a biological revolution would be necessary. Among other things, such a revolution would require technological changes which would permit extrauterine reproduction of children. Other radical feminists have established their own companies and even banks in order to challenge male domination over capital resources and decision-making positions.

A more recent theoretician, Al Hibri (1981) explains capitalism as an evolved form of patriarchy and says therefore that it is necessary to combat capitalism everywhere, even when in the hands of women with feminist ideals.

While radical feminism explains the division of labor, economic and political power between the sexes as due to biological differences, i.e. that sex is gender, their observations are frequently based on recent western gender characteristics, and historical examinations would discover many flaws. However, their emphasis that the "personal is political" and that they dare to take up the question of gender as viable and important for understanding society as a subject to change, makes this theory an important addition to feminism.

John L. ...

Lesbian Separatism

While lesbian separatists agree with the radical feminists on the origins of female oppression, they see the institution of heterosexuality and marriage as the primary tool of dominance. They see it as the basic obstacle to women uniting against the patriarchal power and therefore lesbianism becomes more than a personal preference, it becomes a political decision taken within the context of a political struggle.

Dual System Theories:

Socialist Feminism:

Socialist feminists essentially agree with the historical method of Marx and Engels, that human nature varies according to changes in the mode of production. However, socialist feminists challenge the traditional Marxist concept of what constitutes the mode of production. Instead of looking at life as a mere technicality where people organize to provide clothing, shelter and food, they include people's needs for sexuality, nurture and babies. This means that socialist feminists accept the radical feminist view that women's oppression is at least partially rooted in the so-called personal sphere.

Gayle Rubin (1978) has dated the origin of this oppression to the institution of private property through the institution of kinship and later monogamy, which she sees as the most widely prevailing form of the sex/gender system. Heidi Hartman in her paper "The unhappy marriage of Marxism and Feminism" (1979, 1981) describes the sexual and economic oppression of women as due to a mutually reinforcing relationship between the patriarchal, rooted in kinship, and the economic structure of society, now capitalism. She argues that even though workers and capitalists have opposite economic interests, they as men have a mutual interest; to control women's labor power (in production and

reproduction) both within their "home" and outside, which means keeping women uncompetitive, low paid and a sexual commodity. The man wants to be the master of his "household" and the capitalist wants the "army" of women's low paid and unpaid labor to remain intact. Socialist feminists argue that this mutual relationship can explain the idea and practice of family wages paid to the male worker, male workers' reluctance to include women in their class struggle, and the hostility against those who dare to cross the gender barricades, to name a few.

The socialist feminists' struggle for the liberation of women is therefore twofold: The struggle against the institution of kinship through male dominance and the struggle against capitalism.

Multi-system Theories:

(Women of Color) or Black Feminism:

Black feminism deals primarily with the politics of difference. They accuse most feminist theoreticians, who are white middle-class women, of being color blind, Marxists for being both sex and color blind, and radical feminists for ignoring the fact that race is usually the reason for loyalty amongst people, not sex. They argue that while sex and class are intensive forms of systematic oppression, race is the most severe obstacle for women's unity because people of one race usually have more interests in common than women of different races. The authors of the 1979 Black feminist statement of the Cambahee River Collective suggests that, "the single most important criterion for the adequacy of a feminist theory is its ability to explain the situation of Black women (women of color): If Black women were free, it would mean that everyone else would have to be free since our freedom would necessitate the destruction of all systems of oppression."

Lesbian Feminism

Lesbian feminism is basically a branch of Black feminism, but in their analysis of the structural systems of domination of race, sex, class and age, lesbian feminists include our socialization that prefers heterosexuality. They feel that this form of socialization has to be altered to provide for liberation of all women.

Barbara Smith: "Feminism which does not include the liberation of all women, without consideration to race, age, class or sexual preference is not feminism, but only an act of self-aggrandization."

..... -"You take delight not in a city's seven or seventy wonders,
but in the answer it gives to a question of yours."
- "Or the question it asks you, forging you to answer,
like Thebes through the mouth of the Sphinx."

(Italo Calvino, "Invisible Cities" 1974)

III

The spatial organization of society; a study of its "sexual spheres":

In this chapter I have especially relied upon studies conducted by; Dolores Hayden, Ames Rapoport, Kevin Lynch, Mary Ellen Mazey and David R. Lee, and Shirley Ardener's edition of "Women and Space".

1.

The physical layout of cities is the combined outcome of cultural, climatic, technological and economic conditions, and it has changed considerably from the first sporadic villages in history which may have served some practicality of common interests, such as need for social contact, defence or economy. Cities have served various purposes throughout history. The old Chinese cities were the center for religion, for the political, aristocratic and the patriarchal power. The walled European cities in the Middle Ages served to defend the interests of the feudal kingdoms. Other cities were built around market places, along the coast, along navigable rivers or in the middle of blooming rural areas, and with the emergence of the bourgeoisie these cities became centers of politics, economy, art and education.

The layout of old Copenhagen in Denmark is a prime example, with a vital harbor and market place, surrounded by canals built for defense purposes. It is a center for art, religion, education and politics. A "hovedstadt" in all the meanings of the word.

The emerging capitalism, spurred on by the industrial revolution, greatly affected the structure of cities. Large-scale industrial specialization required concentration of the laborforce in special areas, to keep the hands near the means of production, and later segregation was used as a strategy

to keep the workers from uniting.

The industrial revolution meant not only a stream of peasants from the countryside into segregated society and cities but also an aesthetic and structural revolution due to technological changes. New technology in warfare made it unnecessary to design cities according to defense or offense like Hausman's Paris. Building technology has changed the "fire safe" layout and has increased the possible density a hundredfold (limited almost only by the strength of the foundations).

It has increased the speed of possible urbanization, often at the cost of multiplicity and craftsmanship, but also resulted in increased "democratization" of quality.

Changes in communication have enabled cities to grow and sprawl in all possible directions. First, affected by land transportation - trams, trains, automobiles - then telecommunications - telephones, telecasts, computers - and finally traffic in air, cities have grown in places which would have been unthinkable in the recent past.

Mass-consumption has been a major idea of capitalism, and its demand for space has been monumental: larger houses, larger cars, more cars, bigger highways, tourism; and the facades of cities have become one huge advertisement billboard.

The centralization of capital sources on a few corporate hands, and the utilization of communication technology now means that the cities no longer serve as self-elected bases for headquarters. (A company with its headquarters in Nevada can perfectly control its business in New York and Indonesia at

the same time.)

Cities are no longer "planned" as the throne of political, cultural and military powers, but instead are designed to be flexible to the waves of capital interests that flow through them, to be service oriented to capitalistic economic interests.

The physical or economic structure of the city as a whole has not been my subject of study these past months, (this certainly would have been ambitious to the point of suicide) but my focus has been on an aspect of the city structure that has remained fairly unchanged throughout the tumultuous history of urbanization: the split between the so-called public sphere and the so-called private sphere.

There are a variety of studies (Lefevre, Simmel, A. Rapoport, R. Sennet) from various disciplines which have approached this question of what is a public and what is a private space, a theme that has as many answers as understandings of these words (public for whom, private for whom, how, psychologically, spatially, economically?)

In my study I have chosen to approach this question from a slightly different angle, i.e. the division of the sexes in society.

Even though women have occupied different roles and places in different societies, as far back in history as our knowledge goes, there has always been a division of the sexes, both in space and work.

One version of this split is most easily verified in the contemporary ideology of the genders where men are socialized to occupy and conquer large and public spaces, to represent women to the outside world. At the same

time, women are taught to limit their spacial movements (no soccer or motor-cycles) and to stay close to their "homes"; What is a nice girl like you doing in a place like this? My purpose in this study was not so much to add to the current body of knowledge, which would have been impossible in such a short time, as it was to formulate new questions and to observe what questions I then would ask of my surroundings.

My analysis is rooted in the theory of socialist feminism, where patriarchy is described as: "not only a hierarchical organization but a hierarchy where particular people fill particular places" (H. Hartman in "Women and Revolution" 1981), and where the economical structure (capitalism) and patriarchy have had mutual interests in keeping the sexes divided, both in space and work. My hypothesis is that spatial organization is a result of socioeconomic and cultural processes which enforce as well as reproduce these processes.

Our male society has cultural and economical interests in keeping the sexes divided.

I will demonstrate that as our cities are planned according to a "philosophy" of sexual division, their structure enforces this division, which then becomes an obstacle to the liberation of women.

2.

"My basic hypothesis .. is that houseform is not simply the result of physical forces or any single causal factor, but is the consequence of a whole range of socio-cultural factors seen in their broadest terms." (Rapoport 1969)

Amos Rapoport has, through his fascinating studies of the houses of the world's people, documented a variety of solutions to basic problems of house design

according to complex interactions among cultural skills and norms, climatic conditions and the potential of natural material. He demonstrates how basic needs such as shelter, eating, sleeping, and coupling evoked very different solutions according to values, form of family, the understanding of privacy, and the need for social interactions. Furthermore he lists the position of women in the society as an important factor in the form and "structure" a house or a housing group takes.

Other studies also show that the spatial organization of a society is divided into different spheres not only according to utility but also according to sex and sexual spheres (Mazey and Lee 1983, Ardener 1981).

In the Nomad tent it is common practice that the sexes sleep in separate corners; in certain African societies where polygamy is practiced, each wife has her own cottage while the husband, the owner of the estate, has none - he visits his wives by turn. The islamic men enclose their women inside cleverly designed houses and courtyards where they occupy the most private rooms and can only enter the men's entertainment locals in order to serve them.

This hierarchy of spaces and sexual spheres is well known in Europe as well.

In medieval times the "center" of the house was where the father took his meals, with his sons nearest to him and the women in less important places and in serving positions. In Victorian houses the men had their own "gentleman's" rooms which women could enter only as servants. (In affluent families the women had their own rooms, overly "feminine" and not nearly as "socially" important as the men's rooms.)

Modern houses carry the same idea - where the unmarried sexes have their own

bedrooms, the kitchen is seen as the woman's temple and ideally the man has his own studio or workshop to retreat to when he comes home from work in the afternoon (Ardener, 1981, Chapman, in "Women and Environment" 1985, Rapoport, 1969).

It is possible to project the microcosm (spatial layout) of the house onto the rest of our society.

As men dominate the public or the important space of the house, they also inhabit the public parts of the city: Today the fortresses of capitalism and decision-making, such as the House of Representatives and the headquarters of IBM, are most visibly occupied by men with women in serving positions. The woman's sphere is seen as the domestic environment. She is socialized to move, talk, and behave quietly (i.e., occupy as little space as possible) while men are taught to move freely, speak loudly and control territory.

This is one explanation of why a disproportionate number of women suffer from agoraphobia, (an English study of 1970 shows that of 500 agoraphobics, 91% were women, 78% were housewives, 12% housewives in part-time jobs, and 10% women in full time jobs), (Anne Chapman, "Space and Place: Territorial Training for Gender Roles, "Women and environments", vol. 7, Winter 1985).

So to examine the spatial segregation of the sexes in society, one must examine not only the actual physical layout but also how the space is occupied.

This segregation is embedded in a universal patriarchal power structure, where women, their work and reproduction, are seen to be the property of men and are protected as such by legislative, customary spatial means. This explains

why, in the case where women are the architects and builders, this basic structure of segregation has not been changed.

Women were frequently the ones who mastered the skills of building; like in ancient Iran, through Greece, the American Indians, to present-day Africa. (The architecture of these periods has strangely enough often been called the "architecture without architects", [Rudofsky 1965, Kennedy 1981]).

In many cases this meant that women were quite influential in society (Iran before Islam, -Al Hibri, 1981, USA before the settlers, -Doris Cole, 1973) but in general, this was not true. There are, however, scholars that claim that though women architects did not control the functions of society through their building activity, the form of buildings they designed were different from those designed by men. Some studies (M. Kennedy 1981, Pignatelli 1979) claim that women's experience, either rooted in her physiology or in socialization, make women design differently than men. Their forms are generally rounder, more enclosed, with emphasis on the practical rather than on the monumental, flexible and holistic rather than specialized.

3.

The inferior status of women in society is not related to the type or amount of work they perform.

Women throughout history have been responsible for a wide range of types of work, but almost universally they have as a sex been solely responsible for the domestic reproductive work of the family, regardless of their age or actual participation in bearing children, (Mitchell 1973).

Before the industrial revolution domestic work was integrated as a part of the household economy. The industrial revolution changed this as most of the former household work was transferred into mass production and became wage work, while most of the reproductive domestic work was left behind ("the prehistoric squaw was preserved alive" as Charlotte P. Gilmann so poignantly said in 1903). It not only kept the status of women's work at a low rank but also became "unseen" because it was not wage work.

According to socialist feminist theory this "hiding" of domestic work came about for several reasons. According to Marxian theory, as the capitalists' benefits lie in the surplus value of the worker's work, then the least amount of means/money that is needed to have the labor force reproduce itself is beneficial. Thus the more unpaid work done in that respect the better.

By tradition embedded in ideology and legislation women had done the domestic reproductive work of the family and it was understood that this work would still be done by women even without payment. To ensure this, however, the "ideology of the family" was enforced through all channels. Literature of the sacredness of motherhood almost invented that instinct. (Reiter 1975), marriage became more and more an outcome of romance than economic contract, the home became the haven for happiness, the women's responsibility, and as will be mentioned later, housework became pictured as play.

The male worker approved of this by accepting "family wages" which made him the primary provider for the family, and therefore still the master of the household, as the work inside the family continued to be based on pre-capitalistic conditions (Hartman, *Women and Revolution* 1981, Mitchell 1971).

For the patriarchal ideal this works, but the reality for the woman was different. Women without male providers were many: single, divorced, widows and mothers. These women had (and still have) to survive on lower wages than men - often as domestic servants, the worst possible occupation as they were actually doing what was considered non-work, besides doing it in isolation. There were more domestic servants in the USA in 1940 than workers in the coal, railroad and automobile industries combined, but very few were unionized and many received very bad treatment. Women worked double work loads, relying in some cases upon prostitution as a means of support.

As women in increasing numbers entered the labor force, they provided competition to the higher paid males, but instead of incorporating women into their class struggle, men tried to exclude women from their unions as well as from the labor force (Zetkin, in "Women Family and Freedom" 1983). Men wanted to hold economic and sexual power over women, which explains why they cooperated with capitalistic interests (also held by men) in confining women to domestic chores, a restriction which is amongst other visible in the "design" heritage and economic reality that we live in.

4.

Before the industrial revolution and the rise of capitalism, the household was composed of the family, a variety of kinship relations, all working more or less for its existence, from the wheelmaker family in London to the farmer in feudal servitude in Russia.

The house or housing group was the "factory." With industrialization and mass production, the house became a symbol for the retreat, the haven for the

working man, where no one could tell him how to behave. With advancement in transportation the ideal middle class home became the suburban home, especially in the USA, away from the stress of the city where the happy wife and children played around in the greenery waiting for papa's wise evening words. Only a few middle class families could afford the dream, but, as many middle class dreams, this became the ideal for the rest of the society.

In the 19th century in Europe and the USA, women, especially middle class women with some time on their hands, started to become politically active. In Europe it was first the liberal movement in which women became engaged (Wollstonecraft, J.S. Mill and Harriet Taylor), and later the socialist movements (Clara Zetkin, Rosa Luxemburg, Emma Goldman).

In the USA many women received their political training through work in the abolition movement and later in the fight for the 15th amendment. This triggered their fight for gaining their own suffrage which wasn't won until the early 20th century.

Isolated groups of "feminists", women fighting for their liberation, became active and engaged in planning different reforms. These groups had different theoretical backgrounds, which were often very diffuse and this may be the reason for the many setbacks these groups suffered (Hayden, 1981, Begus, class discussion, 1985).

Commonly these groups argued that domestic work was a part of the national economy, and they wanted this work to be organized and treated with respect.

The foremost advocates in redesigning the home in the 19th century were:

Charlotte G. Perkins, Elisabeth Cady Stanton, Catherine Beecher, and Melusian Fay Percy. Faithful to the Marxian theory that women's way to economic and therefore sexual equality was to industrialize domestic work so that they would be able to participate in the labor force, many new communities were designed. Communities with centralized community facilities, (kitchen, nursery, laundries, usually highly industrialized as technology had made washing machines, ironing machines and various food processors possible). These facilities were surrounded by kitchenless family apartments (e.g. Alice Constance Austin's "Llano housing" in California 1916, Mary Coleman Stuckert's proposal for city block cooperative, Denver 1878-1893, A. Clapman Lander "Letchworth Garden City, England 1909-1913").

The density was usually rather high and often the intention was to connect these living units to other communities and to the central city by mass transportation such as under- or overground "metroliners", (such as in Edgar Chambless' "Roadtown" 1910).

A few of these communities were built, or service facilities were applied to existing communities (like Jane Addams' offer of cooperative domestic life to professional women at the Hull House 1910, Chicago), but none managed to survive long. In the case where the women cooperated in executing these jobs, the men protested heavily the lack of personal service, "My wife cooperating in making other men comfortable, no indeed." Or in those cases where the women made domestic work an "actual production" by hiring workers (either from the community or from outside), the family wages of the men could not pay for these services. As these communities were often more aimed at freeing women's time than in having her participate in the labor force, (working was not that simple, as respectable work

for middle class women was hard to find; and since a part of the man's status was to have an "idle" wife.)

The American man resisted fiercely these women's attempts toward cooperative living, or even their attempts to get men to participate in the household drudgery, both in words and acts. Even now (the acts of the Carter administration, Reagan administration, moral majority...) 100 years later Charlotte Gilman's Perkins little outraged poem (1889) is still valid:

OH! The Home is utterly perfect!

And all its works within.

To say a word about it-

To criticize or doubt it-

To seek to mend or move it-

To venture to improve it-

Is the unpardonable sin.

However, there were several communities which were run successfully on a cooperative basis, but they were all religious communities where the communitarian ideals were part of the "ground rules." (In those cases, the cooperative living did not change the division of the sexes in space, or work.)

Dolores Hayden has published extensive studies of the feminist initiatives in the last century in her book, The Grand Domestic Revolution, 1981, and of the communal architecture of the religious communities in her book, Seven American Utopias, 1976.

5.

While the feminists in the late 19th and early 20th centuries in the USA were attempting to industrialize domestic work to become a large scale production,

other forces were working against them.

In Europe there was an increasing social unrest - socialism was a vital force and in 1917 the Russian revolution became a fact. Despite the number (USA still very rural) and demographic composition of workers in the USA (with their lack of cultural homogeneity, among others) some precautions had to be taken to avoid duplicating the situation in Europe.

The plan was that if it didn't succeed in preventing workers from rioting, (in New York there was even an architectural competition in designing workers' housing where they were to be isolated from each other as much as possible.) then the worker had to be made conservative. A man owning (and owing) his own lot and preferably a detached house, and being responsible for family and kids, was bound to become a loyal citizen (Hayden 1981, 1984).

"Marxists in their theory that capitalism inevitably would lead to revolution underestimated its capacity to improve conditions of life, to incorporate middle class values into the working class, making them the last and most ardent defenders of patriarchal and puritanical morals." (Reuther, 1975)

The idea of love; the wages of the women and the rewards for the man became increasingly connected to material things.

Mrs. Consumer was "invented". Consumerism, the greatest idea America has given to the world, the idea that workers are to be looked upon not simply as workers or producers but as consumers, (Christine Frederic, Selling Mrs. Consumer 1929).

"The Ladies Home Journal", the Bible of the American home in the early 20th century, which had carried many articles on alternative housing types, advice on planning cooperative use, for example, of domestic appliances, and feminist

theories became increasingly conservative as the publishers were forced by their advertizers to stop this "practical approach" (D. Hayden 1981).

Instead the Ladies Home Journal, along with other women's journals, started to advocate the domestic science ideology. Christine Frederic was the foremost evangelist for this aspect of the "Taylorism" for the specialized domestic technology and the idea that the housewife should train herself to become an efficient executive and purchasing agent for her firm, i.e., the family.

Housework was pictured as an act of virtue and even play, and women became caught in an impossible contradiction. They were the main target and principal consumers of a production that the ideology excluded them from participation in (Mitchell, 1971). "In our society, the ideal happiness has taken material form in the house, and thus the house stands for permanence and separation from the world. Woman, the domestic keeper of that ideal happiness, as herself takes on the house's traditional attributes of enclosure and isolation. No other building type embodies such symbiotic association between occupant and object." (S. de Beauvoir, 1949)

The reality was different; in the first decades of the century many women were working outside the home both as primary providers or as contributors to a joint income. An ideology that says that women didn't work or didn't need to work was an effective tool to keep their wages and protests down (American Working Women, 1976).

Another useful outcome of this ideology for the male society is that the homes were filled with reserve labor. This was evident in World War II, when women were needed in the labor force and suddenly it didn't take a whole day to wash the windows or cook meals.

Communities with service facilities, such as daycare and central kitchens, were built (e.g. Vanport City, Oregon 1943) and "Rosie the Riveter" became "productive" and contributed to winning the war.

Most of these communal facilities were torn down when the war ended, the men returned home and the majority of women lost their paid jobs. This did not happen without protest, but if the women turned happily or angrily to their homes and domestic cores, their short presence in the male sphere was quickly forgotten, at least there. Women felt cheated, and to combat the feeling of worthlessness, child rearing became a major social cult - almost a sad mimicry of the production where the mothers were held responsible for the end result (Mitchell, 1971, Firestone, 1971).

The campaign for consumption resumed and the detached American dreamhouse had more admirers than ever.

Mortgage programs and other projects enabled more and more men to taste the dream and new "communities" were built with enormous speed, without any communal facilities, where individualism was the motto. 75 percent of all housing units in the U.S. are now owner occupied ("Women and American City", 1981, Emily Card). The men worked somewhere out of sight of the rest of the family and had to commute by car. "The working class was finally assimilated into neo-mercantilist or state capitalism as an organ in itself." (Ardenes 1984) The rest of the story is well known.

An economic upswing in the 60's-70's in the U.S.A. (as well as in Europe) caused women to be needed again in large numbers in the work force. Several other things occurred at the same time; availability and security of preventive medicine increased and abortions became better accepted. The W.W. II baby boom generation was graduating from the colleges and leaving them half empty, so programs to reach and educate women became a common means to fill the empty places. These changes resulted in some domestic work being commercialized - fast food, frozen prepared food, day care for children and the elderly, etc., all with a common characteristic: low-paid labor, mostly women. Women working in wage work concentrated in few fields (usually service-oriented and former domestic work) and due to previously explained historic oppression these jobs are low rank and low paid. For women to afford the services formerly done unpaid by themselves, they now have to rely upon even cheaper labor than themselves; thus they reinforce the system.

IV

Conclusion:

I have demonstrated that domestic design and the structure of cities is the result of economic and cultural forces and therefore one cannot be viewed without the other.

It is a growing understanding amongst architects and planners that the existing structure of our surroundings is causing spatial limitations for women, an understanding that is partly forced upon them by the problems that increasing numbers of female-headed households are facing.

It is estimated that around 50% of all children will for at least a few years' period live with only their mother (Mandle, 1979). As women on the average earn 53¢ to each dollar a man makes, if she is lucky enough to be able to get or keep a job with her responsibilities at home, the rapid impoverishment of women is predicted. (It is estimated that by the year 2000 women and their children will be the great majority of people under the poverty level - Sprague 1984).

Already 50% of women with children under 6 years of age are working outside the home, and these women suffer from lack of daycare facilities for their young ones, and face a problem of commuting (48% of women against 78% of men have access to the use of a car.) from home to school, to daycare, or to do the shopping. (Shopping malls located at a few places on the outskirts of the town, although practical for a few affluent people, provide problems for the less well off.) (B. Aas, 1981, APA Journal 1983, Women and the American City, 1981.)

Many divorced women left behind with the kids in the suburbs have problems

maintaining the standards of the neighborhood. The impoverishment of suburbia, which started with the energy crisis in the 60's, is spreading. A uniform housing market and strict zoning laws make it difficult to accommodate the various forms of "families," from single to the periodically large extended one. (Only 7% of American citizens live in the ideal family, Papa working, Mama baking apple pies, and 2 kids under 16 years old...) (J. Sprague, APA Conference, 1985). While the two career family can still afford the expenses of living in a "dreamhouse" the whole idea is gaining bizarre overtones.

A study has shown that the work input needed to run a "successful" home and family "in spite of all labor saving appliances averages over 90 hours per week". (Chase Manhattan bank, 1983). This study also estimated that if housework were calculated as a part of the GNP then it would rise approximately 20%.

Although a few men have started to participate in performing this unpaid labor, this is not true in general (Falkinger 1983, Smith R., ed., 1979).

All these problems rising from the patriarchal ideology of women's place in society and the capitalistic profits of this situation are now surfacing and being documented. These issues are now a major theme at every planning conference, and a few schools have been taking these issues up in their curricula.

(I sent a questionnaire to 20 of the major schools of architecture and planning in the USA, and of the 9 which responded, only 2 had organized programs with either emphasis on the history of women in architecture, or a feminist approach.

to design. These schools were MIT and UCLA.)

These issues are often, however, viewed as special "women's" problems, and the proposed solutions tend therefore to reflect this.

There are books upon books written on how to enable the "working" mother/woman to fulfill all her traditional roles, to be a good mother, emotional supporter for the whole family (including old relatives), a tidy housekeeper, sexy, and a successful and good provider. Meanwhile, the term "working father" is barely mentioned. At the American Planning Conference in Montreal, Canada, April 1985, only one speaker in the large section of "Woman and the Changing Family" referred to the problems women face as originating in the role of the family with women as key actors in a capitalistic/patriarchal society.

The most discussed reforms/attitudes to planning and design are:

- 1) Increased density in housing, to allow the "selfhelp" network of neighborhood women to function and lessen distances.
- 2) A change in zoning laws and the ways of acquiring mortgages to enable various compositions of families or groups of people to either rent or buy a house together.
- 3) To plan some forms of public transport even in the most sprawling areas.
- 4) To urbanize domestic space and therefore break the isolation of the woman in the "house", (i.e., over half of physical violence against women takes place in their homes).
- 5) To domesticate the urban space, by better access for women, children and elderly to enjoy and use the facilities and participate in the spatial picture. (Currently, women suffer both from extreme graphic and physical

hostility in most urban areas.) Other reforms advocate the need for transitional housing with access to job training (Sprague, 1985) and the need for part time and flex time jobs.

My opinion is that as long as the capital forces see the practicality of women being in the labor force, and while the only way to keep up a high level of consumption is to provide women a usable environment, changes in that direction will occur in various forms. As mentioned earlier the private sector has already gone into the private children and elderly care business, fastfood and frozen food companies are skyrocketing, and even though the building industry has not yet realized that the traditional nuclear family is almost history, some changes have occurred there. (e.g. the miniaturizing of apartments and houses, and the provision of some communal facilities) use of a flex time program in some jobs are now common, though admittedly primarily to avoid jammed highways.

Although I cannot see the current reforms or even discussions so revolutionary as to challenge the sexual division of labor, economy and power in society, these discussions reflect sectoral concern and local actions, reminiscent of guerrilla tactics of how to survive in a hostile environment.

A broader feminist movement with a theoretical background in a socialist theory is needed if any structural changes are to be made in society instead of temporary relief that fluctuates with any political or economic climate.

Bibliography

- Aas Berit. Krinner i alle land, handbok i trigjøring. Norway, H. Aschehoug & Co., 1981.
- Allen, Irving Lewis, Ed., New Towns and the Suburban Dream: Ideology and Utopia in Planning and Development. New York, Kennicat Press Corporation, 1977.
- Anthony, Susan B. and Stanton, Elizabeth Cady. Correspondence, writings, speeches, New York, Schocken Books, 1981.
- Anzaldua, and Moraga, Cherrie. This Bridge Called My Back. Massachussetts Persephone Press, 1981.
- Aptheker, Bettina. Woman's Legacy: Essays On Race, Sex, and Class in American History. MIT Press, 1982.
- Ardener, Shirley. Women and Space. New York, St. Martin's Press, 1981.
- Baxandall, R. Gordon, L. Reverby, S. America's Working Women, a Documentary History - 1600 to the Present. New York, Random House Inc., 1976.
- de Beauvoir, Simone. The Second Sex. (1949) New York, Vintage Books, 1974.
- Bebel, August. Woman and Socialism. New York, Socialist Literature company, 1910.
- Beecher, Catharina E. and Harriet Beecher Stowe. The American Woman's Home. New York, J.B. Ford and Company, 1869.
- Bell, Susan G. & Otten Karen M. Ed., Women, the Family, and Freedom: The Debate in Documents 1880-1950. California, Stanford University Press, 1983.
- Birkby, Phyllis. Women and the Built Environment; Present Realities and Future Visions. Paper, August 21, 1979 Workshop.
- Bluestone, Barry and Harrison, Bennet. The Decentralization of America. New York, Basic Books, 1982.
- Cole, Doris. From Tipi to Skyscraper: A History of Women in Architecture. Boston, I Press Corporated, 1973.
- Cooper, Clare C. Easter Hill Village: Some Social Implications of Design. New York, The Free Press, 1975.
- Dixler, E. Nelson, M.I., Stimpson, C.R. Tatrakis, K.B. Ed. Women and the American City. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1980.

- Dörum, Sissel. Walking in Balance on Mother Earth. Unpublished paper, Oslo, 1982.
- Eisenstein, Zillah. The Radical Future of Liberal Feminism. Boston, NU Press, 1981.
- Engels, Frederick. The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. (1884). New York, International Publishers, 1981.
- Erikson, Erikh. Childhood and Society. New York, W. W. Norton, 1950.
- Falkinger, Ann. Jeute and Argumerter. Oslo, Grøndahl & Søn Forlag A.S. 1983.
- Firestone, Shulamith. The Dialectic of Sex. New York, 1971.
- Friedan, Betty. The Feminine Mystique. New York. W. W. Norton & Company, 1963.
- Friedan, Betty. The Second Stage. New York. Summit Books, 1981.
- Gerson, Menachem. Family, Women, and Socialization in the Kibbutz. Massachussetts, Lexington Books, 1978.
- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. Womenand Economics (1898), New York, Source Books, 1970.
- Goldman, Emma. Red Emma Speaks. New York, Vintage Books, 1972.
- Hall, E. T. The Hidden Dimension. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc. 1966.
- Hapgood, Karenand Getzel, Judit. Planning, Women and Change. Chicago, American Society of Planning Officials, 1974.
- Hartman, Mary S. Victorian Murderesses. New York, Schocken Books, 1977.
- Hayden, Dolores. Seven American Utopias: The Architecture of Communitarian Socialism. 178-1975. Boston, MIT Press, 1976.
- Hayden, Dolores. The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods and Cities. Boston, MIT Press, 1981.
- Hayden, Dolores. Redesigning the American Dream: The Future of Housing, Work, and Family Life. New York, W. W. Norton & Company, 1984.
- Jagger, Alison M., Rothenberg, Paula S. Ed., Feminist Frameworks (1978). New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1984.
- Kennedy, Margit. Gyn/Ecology: On the Relationship Between Woman/Nature/Space. A Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Finnish Association of Woman Architects in Helsinki, March 1984.

- Lee, David R., Mazey, Mary Ellen. Her Space, Her Place: A Geography of Women. Washington, Resource Publications in Geography, 1983.
- Lynch, Kevin. A Theory of Good City Form. Cambridge, MIT, 1981.
- Mandle, Joan D. Women and Social Change in America. New Jersey, Princeton Book Company, 1979.
- McClain, Janet. One Step Forward, Two Steps Back. Paper APA Canada U.S. Conference, April, 1985.
- Mill, John S. and Harriet Taylor, Rossi Alice, Ed. Essays on Sex and Equality. University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Mitchell, Juliet: Woman's Estate (1971). New York, Vintage Books, 1973.
- Mitchell, Juliet. Psycho-Analysis and Feminism (1974). New York, Vintage Books, 1975.
- Mitchell, Juliet. Women, The Longest Revolution (1966). New York, Pantheon, 1984.
- Moraga, Cherrie. Loving in the War Years. Boston, South End Press, 1983.
- Oakley, Ann. Woman's Work: The Housewife, Past and Present. New York, Vintage Books. 1976.
- Pierce, Melusina F. Cooperative Housekeeping: How Not To Do It and How To Do It. A Study in Sociology. Boston, James R. Osgood, 1884.
- Pignatelli, Paola Coppola, Der Weg zu einer andoen raumlichen logik. Paper Published in Banwelt, Heft, 31/32, 1979.
- Journal of the American Planning Association. "Planning and the Changing Family", Special issue, Vol. 49. (Spring 1983)
- Rapoport, Ames. House, Form and Culture. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1969.
- Rapoport, Ames. Human Aspects of Urban Form. New York, Pergamen Press, Ltd. 1977.
- Reiter, Rayna R. Towards an Anthropology of Women. New York, Monthly Review Press, 1975.
- Rosenberg, Charles E. The Family in History. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975.
- Rossi, Alice S. Ed. The Feminist Papers: (1973) From Adams to De Beauvoir. New York, Bantam Books, 1976.
- Rowbowtham, Sheila. Woman's Consciousness, Man's World. New York, Penguin 1973.

- Rowbowtham, Sheila. Hidden From History: Rediscovering Women in History, from the 17th Century to the Present. New York, Pantheon Books, 1975.
- Rudofsky, Bernard. Architecture without Architects. New York, Doubleday & Co., Inc. 1965.
- Ruether, Rosemary Raelford. New Woman, New Earth: Sexist Ideologies and Human Liberation. New York, Seabury Press, 1975.
- Sargent, Lydia, Ed. Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism. Boston, South End Press, 1981.
- Sennet, Richard. The Fall of Public Man (1974). New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1977.
- Schlay, Anne B. and DiGregorio, Dauce A. "Same City Different Worlds: Examining Gender and Work Based Differences in Perceptions of Neighborhood Desirability". Paper presented at the "Metro Center" January 1985.
- Smith, Barbara, Ed., Home Girls. A Black Feminist Anthology. New York, Kitchen Table,---Women of Color Press, 1983.
- Smith, Ralph. The Subtle Revolution: Women At Work. Washington, D.C. Urban Land Institute, 1979.
- Spender, Dale. Man Made Language (1980). Routledge & Keagan Paul, 1985.
- Sprague, Joan F. A Development Primer: Starting Housing or Business Ventures By And/Or For Women. Red Sun Press, 1984.
- Torre, Susanna, Ed. Women in American Architecture: A Historic and Contemporary Perspective. New York, Watson-Guption Publications, 1977.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. A Vindication of the Rights of Woman (1792, London ed.) New York, W. W. Norton & Company 1975.
- Antipode, A Radical Journal of Geography, "Women and the Environment", Vol. 6, Number 3. 1984.
- Wright, Gwendolyn. Building the Dream: A Social History of American Housing. New York, Pantheon Books, 1981.